

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for last Advisory Action mailed 2001, June 12. Amendments of claims 16-18 are proposed in an effort to make them more easily readable. Of course, no new matter is added with this amendment. If the Examiner sees a better way to write these claims, applicant thanks him in advance for any constructive suggestion pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j).

2. Regarding the drawings, applicant fully agrees with the Examiner that Figures 12-14 just show one version of many possible versions of the disclosed embodiments. The problem is that a lot of figures would be necessary to represent all possible versions of the disclosed embodiments.

Indeed Figure 14 just shows the version where a shackle is used to shape the transverse hole of the movable, that is to say what is disclosed in the original specification from page 22, line 23-24 in view of what is disclosed just before page 22, line 19-22. It does not show what is disclosed in said original specification from page 22, line 25 to page 23, line 2. But claim 15 recites only the features of the version where a shackle is used. It is reminded that in this disclosure "shackle" is more proper than "stirrup" as a translation of the corresponding French word "étrier" from the original French specification. The above-mentioned disclosures of the original specification can be found at the bottom of page 10 and at the top of page 11 of the substitute specification.

Figure 12 only shows what is disclosed in the original specification page 29, lines 10-19 combined to what is disclosed in the original specification page 29, lines 22-28 (second kind of arrangement, when the buffers are not sandwiched). It is selected to have both arms capable of running along the components of the split support part. Each of the movable parts is made of one piece. However the buffers are split. Either coupler is shown in the simplest manner possible, as a common feature to all the possible couplers, i.e. as a succession of interconnected rings. The ZONA brochure (exhibit #4 of paper filed on 03/29/99) gives two examples of couplers. One is made with terminal strips (on the third photograph from the left, on top of the inner page of this brochure where there are only photographs). The other one is made with holders for pairs of water supply pipes against walls in a basement (on the fourth top photograph from the left and on the left central bottom photograph of the inner page of this brochure where there are only photographs). But Figure 12 does not show what is disclosed in the original specification page 29, lines 19-22 (first kind of arrangement) and what is disclosed in the original specification page 29, lines 29-36 (second kind of arrangement, when the buffers are sandwiched). Claims 12-13 only recite features, which are shown in Figure 12.

Figure 13 only shows what is disclosed in the original specification from page 29, line 36 to page 30, line 7. And accordingly claims 12 and 14 only recite features, which are shown in Figure 13.

The disclosures of the original specification, which have been just cited to delimit

Appn. Number: 08/580,493

Figures 12-13 and claims 12-14, can be found page 14, lines 3-31 of the substitute specification.

So all versions in the original specification, which support proposed new Figures 12-14 have been pointed out. Hence favorable reconsideration of proposed Figures 1-14 is petitioned with deference.

- 3. An attempt has been made to make second part of claims 16-18 easier to be read and understood by a proposed amendment (first part reproduces almost strictly what the Examiner suggested in papers 56 and 59). Last paragraph of these claims has been split into a cascade of sentences.**

On the other hand, the phrase "sliding in direction of said object" has been maintained because it is believed that applying the contact face of the buffer without first of all sliding the movable arm towards the object along the support part cannot be achieved. In the original specification page 24, lines 18-22, it is advised to slide first (by pushing) the arms to get the application of the contact faces of the buffers against the corresponding surfaces. That is because it can be understood that applying directly a buffer (which is located at a distance of the support part) could tilt its supporting arm and lock it against said support part and consecutively prevent any move of said arm.

But anyway, as it was written above, if the Examiner sees a better way to write these claims, applicant thanks him in advance for any constructive suggestion pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j).

4. Conclusion

Every ground of disapproval or rejection has been responded to in accordance with 37 CFR 1.111 and only amendments complying with 37 CFR 1.116 (a) are submitted. Therefore favorable reconsideration, entering of the drawings such as submitted on 01/10/01, entering of the proposed amendments of the present paper and allowance of claims 16-18 are petitioned with deference.

Very Respectfully submitted.

Philippe BERNARD

Philippe Berna, Applicant Pro Se

**Mailing Address: Mas Liotard - Les Brousses, 30410 Molières-sur-Cèze,
France - Phone and Fax Number: (33) 46 624 3518**